



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in exercise of the police power of the state. 26 AM. & ENG. ENCY. OF LAW, (Ed. 2) 661, 662, and cases cited. And in COOLEY, CONST. LIM. *195, the limitation on the power in a municipal corporation to control the owners of property is stated thus: "Except as to incidental powers, and which need not be, though they usually are, mentioned in the charter, the charter itself on the general law under which they exist, is the measure of the authority to be exercised. And the general disposition of the courts in this country has been to confine municipalities within the limits that a strict construction of the grants of powers in their charters will assign to them; thus applying substantially the same rule that is applied to charters of private incorporation." The application of these principles to the statute under consideration, which it must be admitted is very broad in its terms, seems to justify the conclusion of the court that the words "all repairs" should be limited to mean such repairs as affect the fire risk"

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—POLICE POWER—HEALTH—VALIDITY OF ORDINANCE REGULATING LOCATION OF LAUNDRIES.—A Chinese laundryman, detained in custody for violation of an ordinance prohibiting the operating of a public laundry in any portion of a building used as a store, petitioned for a writ of habeas corpus. *Held*, that the ordinance is not unreasonable or oppressive, but is a valid exercise of police power to promote the public health and the writ must be denied. *Ex parte San Chung* (1909), — Cal. App. —, 105 Pac. 609.

The police power is very broad and is exercised to promote public health but it is subordinate to the constitution. *In re Jacobs*, 98 N. Y. 98, 50 Am. Rep. 636; *Ex parte Sing Lee*, 96 Cal. 354, 356, 31 Pac. 245, 246, 24 L. R. A. 195, 31 Am. St. Rep. 218. And the courts will declare invalid a law which is a mere pretense to protect public health or which passes "entirely beyond the limits which bound the police power, and infringes upon rights secured by the fundamental law." *Ex parte Whitwell*, 98 Cal. 73, 78, 32 Pac. 870, 872, 19 L. R. A. 727, 35 Am. St. Rep. 152; *Mugler v. Kansas*, 123 U. S. 623, 661, 8 Sup. Ct. 273, 297, 31 L. Ed. 205. But the fact that a regulation designed to promote the public health imposes unequal restrictions on different persons does not furnish just ground for declaring the law void. *Barbier v. Connolly*, 113 U. S. 27, 31, 5 Sup. Ct. 357, 359, 28 L. Ed. 923. Although the foregoing principles are well established yet it is often difficult to apply them in a particular case. A consideration of modern ideas in sanitation and "the broader conception of the duty of the municipality in regard to the preservation and protection of the public health" forces us to the conclusion that although formerly such an ordinance as that in question might have been "regarded as an unwarranted encroachment upon the rights of the individual," the court in the case under discussion made a proper application of well settled principles.

NEGLIGENCE—LIABILITY OF PROPRIETOR OF PLACE OF AMUSEMENT TO CUSTOMER.—The plaintiff went into a billiard hall, of which the defendants were joint owners, for the purpose of playing a game of pool. While peaceably enjoying his game, with one of the proprietors present, a fight started among some intoxicated occupants of the resort, during which one of the disorderly